

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-20 are all the claims presently pending in the application. Claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-20 have been amended to more particularly define the claimed invention. Claims 3, 8, 13 and 15 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants specifically state that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Claims 3 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Schwab (U.S. Patent No. 6,226,412). Claims 10-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Noguchi (U.S. Patent No. 6,711,285). Claims 1 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schwab, in view of Enokida (U.S. Patent No. 6,473,859). Claims 4-6 and 16-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,209,097), in view of Matsunoshita (U.S. Patent No. 6,603,864). Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, et al., in view of Minamizawa, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,298,421). Claims 8-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakayama, et al., in view of Minamizawa, et al., as applied to claim 7 above, in further view of Blanco, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,482). Claims 12-13 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Noguchi, in view of Fujino, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,173,418).

These rejections are respectfully traversed in the following discussion.

I. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

A. Claims 3 and 15

The Examiner alleges that Schwab teaches the claimed invention of claims 3 and 15. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention, which are neither taught nor suggested by Schwab.

However, merely in an effort to speed prosecution, Applicants have canceled claims 3 and 15, thus rendering the Examiner's rejection moot.

Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

B. Claims 10, 11 and 19

The Examiner alleges that Noguchi teaches the claimed invention of claims 10, 11 and 19. Applicants submit, however, that there are elements of the claimed invention, which are neither taught nor suggested by Noguchi.

That is, Noguchi does not teach or suggest "*a size adjustment unit for adjusting a size of the converted image data to obtain the image size printed by the image printing unit designed by said designation unit*", as recited in claim 10 and somewhat similarly recited in claim 19.

According to the claimed invention, a size of the converted image data is adjusted to the image size printed by the image printing unit designated by the designation unit (e.g., see Application at page 31, lines 9-10).

In stark contrast, in Noguchi (see Noguchi at Figure 2), when the floppy disk (FD) is set to the information storage medium reader 22, image data stored in the FD is read out.

The information storage medium reader 22 transfers the read image data to the image data converter 14 together with information that the output destination of the image data is the printer 34. The image data transferred from the information storage medium reader 22 is converted into a predetermined file structure in the I/F circuit 16 (see Noguchi at column 10, lines 5-12).

Noguchi does not adjust size of the converted image data to the image size of the printer 34.

Therefore, Noguchi does not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

C. Claims 1 and 14

The Examiner alleges that Schwab would have been combined with Enokida to teach the claimed invention of claims 1 and 14. Applicants submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Schwab nor Enokida, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*a transmitting unit for transmitting an image file storing image data that has been encrypted by said encryption unit and data representing the client terminal selected by said selection unit*”, as recited in claim 1 and somewhat similarly recited in claim 14.

According to the claimed invention, the encrypted image data and the data representing the client terminal selected by the selection unit are stored in the image file (e.g., see Application at Figure 10B). Since the image file is transmitted to the selected client

terminal, the selected client terminal can decide whether the transmitting destination of the image data stored in the image file is the selected client terminal itself or not.

In stark contrast, in Schwab, the client PC 60 can decrypt the R format image file and the client PC 70 can decrypt the T format image file. If the T format image file is received in the client PC 60, then the T format image file is converted to the R format image file in the central database computer 80.

In Enokida, referring to Figure 1, the client side 104 requests the image to the server side 103, and requests the key information to the server side 103. The key information is transmitted to the client side 104 from the server side 103.

Neither Schwab nor Enokida (taken alone or in combination) teaches transmitting the image file storing the encrypted image data and the data representing the selected client terminal.

Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

D. Claims 4-6, 16 and 17

The Examiner alleges that Nakayama would have been combined with Matsunoshita to teach the claimed invention of claims 4-6, 16 and 17. Applicants submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Nakayama nor Matsunoshita, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests *“a printing unit, which is responsive to a print command applied by said print*

command unit, for printing, on the same visible recording medium, the image that has been selected by said image selection unit and information relating to a copyright holder of the selected image”, as recited in claim 4 and somewhat similarly recited in claim 16.

According to the claimed invention, when a command to print a selected image is applied, the selected image and information relating to the copyright holder of the image are printed on the same visible recording medium. Since an image and information relating to the copyright holder of the image are recorded on the same visible recording medium, the copyright holder of the image can be ascertained merely by looking at the visible recording medium. Since the copyright holder of the image can be determined, unlawful use of the printed image can be prevented.

In stark contrast, in Nakayama (referring to Figure 1) the floppy disk 7 storing the encrypted image data is set to the floppy disk drive 3, and the encrypted image data and data specifying the number of prints are stored in the recording medium 6b. The recording medium 6b is set to the print service center 5, the encrypted data is decrypted at the print service center 5, and the image is printed and the images of the number of prints represented by the data specifying the number of prints are printed at the print service center 5.

In Matsunoshita, the additional data is embedded in the image data.

Neither Nakayama nor Matsunoshita teaches or suggests the above feature of the claimed invention.

Moreover, neither Nakayama nor Matsunoshita, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*a determination unit for determining whether an image that has been read by said scanner contains visible information relating to a copyright holder of the image*”, as recited in claim 6 and somewhat similarly recited in claim 17.

According to the claimed invention, an image that has been recorded on the visible recording medium is read. It is determined whether the read image contains visible information relating to the copyright holder of this image. If it is determined that the read image does not contain visible information relating to the copyright holder of the image, then the read image is printed. If it is determined that the read image contains visible information relating to the copyright holder of the image, then normal printing of this read image is halted.

Neither Nakayama nor Matsunoshita teaches or suggests the above feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

E. Claim 7

The Examiner alleges that Nakayama would have been combined with Minamizawa to teach the claimed invention of claim 7. Applicants submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Nakayama nor Minamizawa, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*an installation-count reading unit for reading the installation-count data indicating number installations recorded on the second portable recording medium;*”

a determination-halt unit for halting password determination by said password determination unit when a number of installations represented by the installation-count data read by said installation-count reading unit is zero;

a second installation execution unit for executing the installation in response to the halting of password determination by said determination-halt unit; and

an incrementing unit for incrementing the number of installations, which is represented by the data that has been recorded in said second portable recording medium, in response to execution of installation by said second installation execution unit”, as recited in claim 7.

Indeed, the Examiner does not even allege that Nakayama Minamizawa teaches or suggests this feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

F. Claims 8 and 9

The Examiner alleges that Nakayama would have been combined with Minamizawa and Blanco to teach the claimed invention of claims 8 and 9. Applicants submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Nakayama nor Minamizawa nor Blanco, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*an installation-count reading unit for reading the installation-count data indicating number installations recorded on the second portable recording medium;*

a determination-halt unit for halting password determination by said password determination unit when a number of installations represented by the installation-count data read by said installation-count reading unit is zero;

a second installation execution unit for executing the installation in response to the halting of password determination by said determination-halt unit; and

an incrementing unit for incrementing the number of installations, which is represented by the data that has been recorded in said second portable recording medium, in response to execution of installation by said second installation execution unit”, as recited in claim 7.

According to the claimed invention, when the number of installations is zero, the first installation takes place. When installation is performed the first time, this is construed as being a lawful installation and execution of the installation is allowed.

The Examiner asserts that the PppProfile of Blanco corresponds to the number of installations of the claimed invention. However, the PppProfile of Blanco does not indicate the number of installation. The PppProfile is a flag that indicates if the user should use his remote access password or not when using a remote access (see Blanco at column 5, lines 14-16). Since the PppProfile is a flag, it can not count the number of installations.

Furthermore, as indicated in section E, above, the alleged combination of Nakayama and Minamizawa also fails to teach or suggest this feature of the claimed invention.

Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.

G. Claims 12, 13 and 20

The Examiner alleges that Noguchi would have been combined with Fujino to teach the claimed invention of claims 12, 13 and 20. Applicants submit, however, that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention.

That is, neither Noguchi nor Fujino, nor any combination thereof, teaches or suggests “*an aggregating unit for aggregating, for each of the plurality of printing units, the data which represents printing history and the format of which has been converted by said format conversion unit*”, as recited in claim 13 and somewhat similarly recited in claim 20.

The Examiner asserts that the above feature is disclosed in Figure 2 of Fujino. In Fujino, however, the agent 20 inputs log data from a group of log files on the alert 30, and the normalized log data is stored to the normalized log file 40. In Fujino, the printing history data is not aggregated in each of the plurality of printing units.

Therefore, Applicants submit that, even if combined, the alleged combination of references would not teach or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Therefore, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw this rejection.


II. FORMAL MATTERS AND CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-12, 14 and 16-20, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,


Scott M. Tulino, Esq.
Reg. No. 48,317

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Reg. No. 34,386

Date: November 28, 2006
MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254